CIVIL COVER SHEET

The IS-44 crivil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules (Feouri, This form, approved by the Indical Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the crivil docket sheet. (SZE INSTRICTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

| I. (a) PLAINTIFFS | | | | DEFENDANTS | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| DEVEN W. WERLING | | | | MARK EGGLETON - SEE ATTACHED SHEET FOR CONTINUATION | | | |
| (b) Courty of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Pinellas (FL (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES) | | | | County of Residence of | f First Listed Defendant | Allegheny | |
| | | | | (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE | | | |
| | | | | | NYOLVED | s, use the bocation of the | |
| (c) Adverying an Name Advanced Lington Number) Timothy P. O'Brien, Esquire (412) 232-440 | | | | Attorneys (If Karen) | | | |
| 1705 Allegheny | Building, Pitt: | sburgh, PA 1 | 5219 | } | | | |
| II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place on "X" in One Box Only) | | | III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES, Place as "X" as One Box for Plaintiff (For Diversity Cases Only) and One Box for De freduct) | | | | |
| DI US Gresses | Frderal Questing | i | PTF | | DIF | PTF DEF | |
| Po and | (US Germani | Not a Porty) | | en of This State 🔯 | af Business In | er Francipal Place 🔲 4 🗐 4 n Thir State | |
| D 2 US Government Defendant | O 4 Doorsey | o of Parties in Item III) | Cate | en of Another Sum S | | and Principal Place 🗍 5 🗍 5 4 To Another State | |
| | (1444) | y 44 (4704) 2 (42 117) | | en or Subject of a O | 3 D 3 Forega Natio | | |
| IV. NATURE OF SUIT | اس اد ها دس سے ایک ندا دیدیا | | | | | | |
| CONTRACT | | | | PETTURE PENALTY | BANKRUPTCS | OTHER STATUTES | |
| O 110 houses O 120 Warner | PERSONAL INJURY 3 310 Auralian | PERSONAL INJUR 342 Personal Injury - | | 18 Agriculture 20 Other Food & Drug | (C) 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 (C) 423 Withdrawal | 3 400 State Reapportsonment 3 410 Anterest | |
| D IN NOW AN | 3 315 Auphor Product | Ned Mulpacine | | i25 Drug Related Sectors | 28 USC 157 | 3 430 Banks and Banking | |
| O 147 Kepesaker Bustonen | Lubbry | D 365 Personal layery - | | of Property 21 USC 951 | | 3 450 Commerce | |
| A Enterement of Judgment | D 120 Amerik Libri & Simbre | Product Liability 348 Ashesses Prinesi | | 30 Liquor Laws 40 R.R. & Truck | PROPERTY RIGHTS 3 820 Copyrights | 3 460 Deportation 3 470 Racketeer Influenced and | |
| O 151 Medicare Act | 3 134 Federal Employers" | lajery Product | I - | 50 Airkoe Regs. | J 830 Pares | Corrupt Organizations | |
| D 15; known of Definited | Labite | Lability | | 40 Occupational | J 840 Tredemark | O 410 Concentr Credit | |
| Student Laute (Escil Venezas) | 3 34 Marine 3 345 Marine Product | PERSONAL PROPER 3 30 Other Front | | Safety Health 40 Orber | ŀ | 3 490 Cable SarTV 3 410 Selectore Service | |
| 3 15) Louvery of Overparaces | Lubbey | O 371 Treth in Lending | _ | LABOR | SOCIAL SECURITY | 3 850 Securate Commodities | |
| of Veneral's Beer fes | 3 354 Mater Velocite | 310 Other Personal | 5 1 | 18 Fair Labor Stendards | 2 #41 HTA (13450) | Exchange | |
| D 140 Stock belders" Surb D 140 Other Comme | O 355 Marie Valente | Property Damage | ١, , | Act 20 Labor Mgmt. Relations | コ 842 Black Ling (†23) コ 843 DIWC/DIWW (405(| J 875 Customer Challenge (a)) 12 USC 3410 | |
| D 144 Contract Product Last day | Product Lability 3 144 Other Penasal | (3) 315 Property Damage Product Liability | | 30 Labor Memi Reporting | □ 864 SSID Tale XVI | 3 890 Other Statutory Actions | |
| Cl. 10s Franchise | h-ro | | | & Disclosum Act | 3 865 RS1 (405/g)) | 3 891 Agricultural Acts | |
| BEAL PROPERTY | CIVIT BIGHTS | PRISONER PETITIO | | 40 Raile sy Labor Act | FEDERAL TAX SUIT | | |
| D 210 Lind Continuous D 220 Free have | 3 44) Yering 3 44) Emphysizat | 3 510 Mattern to Vacat Sentence | | 90 Other Labor Linganon 91 Empl. Ret. Inc. | 3 870 Taxes (U.S. Planuff or Defendant) | 3 893 Environmental Matters 3 894 Energy Allocation Act | |
| 3 230 Rest Lane & Ejectment | 3 41 Reserve | Babeas Corpes: | 17 ' | Security Act | 371 IRS - Third Party | 3 895 Freedom of Information | |
| O 240 Tare to Lond | Accressed street | 3 530 General | - l | • | 26 USC 760% 👊 | _ Acl | |
| 345 Test Product Lashing 3 246 All Other Real Property | □ 444 を成ee □ 445 April to Delablage ・ | □ 535 Drath Prosky □ 546 Mandamon & Oil | l | | | O 400 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access | |
| | Employment | 350 Crest Rights | ~ | | | to Justice | |
| | Other Other Croil Rights | 3 555 Prom Condition | | | | 2 950 Consident on State States | |
| ORIGIN (Part | m "X" in Our Bes Onto) | <u> </u> | | | <u> </u> | Appeal to District | |
| Original D 2 R | convention D 3 | Remanded from Appellare Court | 7 4 Rein Recy | stated or 5 another | | idistrict D 7 Judge from Magistrate | |
| | Civil's Right | s Act of 187 | filing s | (Do not cite jurisdiction amended 42 | al statutes unless diversi 1.5.C. Section | | |
| VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO | //· | | | | | ts under U.S. Con. | |
| VII. REQUESTED IN O CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P.23 | | | | DEMAND 5 CHECK YES only if complaint JURY DEMAND XX YO D No | | | |
| VIII. RELATED CASE | (5) | | | | | | |
| IF ANY | (Set de Bruchen) | JEDGE | | _ | DOCKET NUMBER | | |
| June 29, 2005 | 1/2 | SIGNATURE OF) | KY Y | OFRECORD | | | |
| TOR OFFICE LAG ONLY | | 11-10 | 1 | 7 | | | |
| BICTING A | MAUST | APPLYING ISP | | RUDGE | MYC | RIDGE | |

JS 44AREVISED OCTOBER, 1993

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

THIS CASE DESIGNATION SHEET MUST BE COMPLETED

| FARIA | |
|---|--|
| This case belongs on the (| _ErieJohnstown XX Pittsburgh) calendar. |
| | of action arose in the counties of Crawford, Elk, Erie, Forest, McKean, Venang |
| 1. | · |
| or Warren, OR any plaintiff | or defendant resides in one of said counties. |
| | R - If cause of action arose in the counties of Bedford, Blair, Cambria, Clearfield or |
| | defendant resides in one of said counties. |
| - | NDAR: I certify that the cause of action arose in County and |
| | resides inCounty. |
| | N CALENDAR: I certify that the cause of action arose in |
| | resides in County. |
| County 200 (221 (211 | |
| PART B (You are to check ON | f of the following) |
| | umberJudge |
| YY This must not related | |
| 2 A S I W I W I W I W I W I W I W I W I W I | to a pending or terminated case. |
| DEFINITIONS OF RELATED | CASTS. |
| | |
| | elated when a case filed relates to property included in another suit or involves the |
| _ | ut of the same transactions as another suit or involves the validity or infringement |
| of a patent involved in another s | |
| | contiguous closely located groups and in common ownership groups which will |
| | for trial shall be deemed related. |
| | RIGIITS: All babeas corpus petitions filed by the same individual shall be deemed |
| related. All pro se Civil Rights a | ctions by the same individual shall be deemed related. |
| | |
| PARTC | |
| 1. CIVIL CATEGORY (Place | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 1. () Antitrust and Se | |
| 2. () Labor-Managen | nent Relations |
| Habeas Corpus | |
| (4. (X) Chill Rights | |
|) Patent, Copyri | ght, and Trademark |
| 6. () Eminent Dom | ain |
| 7. () All other feder: | ıl question cases |
| \$. () All personal as | d property damage tort cases, including maritime, FELA, Jones Act, Motor |
| vehicle, produc | ts liability, assault, defamation, malicious prosecution, and false arrest |
| 9. () Insurance inde | maky, contract and other diversity cases. |
| 10. () Government | Collection Cases (shall include HEW Student Loans (Education), |
| VA Overpay | ment, Overpayment of Social Security, Enlistment Overpayment (Army, Navy, etc.), |
| | O Loans (Misc. Types), Mortgage Foreclosures, S.B.A. Loans, Civil Penalties and |
| | alty and Reclamation Fees.) |
| | • |
| | \wedge |
| | |
| I certify that to the best of m | y knowledge the entries on this Case Designation Sheet are true and correct |
| | 1./1.00/ |
| Date: June 29, 2005 | 1/2/11/11/11 |
| Date: | |
| | ATTORNEY AT LAW |
| | Timothy P. O'Brien. Fsquire |

NOTE: ALL SECTIONS OF BOTH SIDES MUST BE COMPLETED BEFORE CASE CAN BE PROCESSED.

Case 2:05-cv-00898-AJS Document 1 Filed 06/29/05 Page 3 of 11

NO ZUM

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

1541

DEVEN W. WERLING,

٧.

Plaintiff.

Civil Action No.

05 0898

MARK EGGLETON, THE CITY OF PITTSBURGH, ORIGINAL HOT DOG SHOPS, INC., Trading and Doing Business as THE ORIGINAL HOT DOG SHOP, And BRIAN ROBERTS,

JURY DEMAND



Defendants.

COMPLAINT IN CIVIL ACTION

INTRODUCTION:

1. This action is brought on behalf of Deven W. Werling to redress the violation of his constitutional and common law rights which occurred when he made what was viewed as a critical remark about the performance of an off-duty City of Pittsburgh police officer employed by the Defendant Original Hot Dog Shops, Inc. This so-called off-duty police officer at the time the events in this case occurred was fully clothed and equipped by the City of Pittsburgh Police Department and cloaked with the authority and power of a City of Pittsburgh police officer even though he was ostensibly under the supervision and control of his private employer, the Original Hot Dog Shops, Inc. This lawsuit contends that the defendant Original Hot Dog Shops, Inc., failed to properly supervise, train, control, and regulate off-duty police officers hired by it to perform security functions, and further alleges

that the defendant City of Pittsburgh has a custom, policy or practice of deliberate indifference to the violation of constitutional rights committed by its police officers engaged in so-called off-duty employment. As a direct result of the defendants' conduct, as herein described, plaintiff's rights under the first, fourth and fourteenth amendments to the United States Constitution were violated, including his right to free speech, his right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures, the right to be free from the use of excessive and unreasonable force, and his right to be free from the filing of false and malicious criminal charges. Plaintiff's common law rights to be free from false imprisonment, arrest, assault and battery, and malicious prosecution were similarly violated.

JURISDICTION:

- 2. This court has jurisdiction over the plaintiff's claims against the above-referenced defendants pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1343, and/or 28 U.S.C. § 1331. This court also has pendent jurisdiction over any of the plaintiff's common law claims asserted herein. PARTIES:
 - 3. Plaintiff Deven W. Werling is an adult individual residing in Largo, Florida.
- 4. The defendant Original Hot Dog Shops, Inc., is a corporation duly authorized to conduct business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and trades and does business as "The Original Hot Dog Shop", with a principal place of business located at 3901 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213.
- 5. At all times relevant hereto, defendant Original Hot Dog Shops, Inc., was acting by and through its duly authorized agents, employees and/or assigns, who were then and there acting in the course and scope of their employment.

- 6. At all times relevant hereto, defendant Original Hot Dog Shops, Inc., employed off-duty City of Pittsburgh Police officers who performed their duties as employees of the defendant Original Hot Dog Shops, Inc., trading and doing business as "The Original Hot Dog Shop", while attired in their City of Pittsburgh Police uniforms, and equipped with City of Pittsburgh Police Department issued equipment, such employees acting under color of state law in the performance of their duties on behalf of defendant, Original Hot Dog Shops, Inc.
- 7. At all times relevant hereto, the defendant Original Hot Dog Shops, Inc., trading and doing business as the "Original Hot Dog Shop", through its negligence, gross negligence, and/or through its deliberate indifference, failed to properly supervise, regulate, train and/or discipline off-duty City of Pittsburgh Police officers hired by it to perform security and related functions at the "Original Hot Dog Shop". This defendant's conduct also included its failure to have in place proper procedures, policies and standards governing the conduct of off-duty police officers employed by it.
- 8. The City of Pittsburgh is a municipality within the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, with a principal place of business located at 414 Grant Street, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15219, which at all times relevant hereto, was authorized to and did operate and maintain a police department. At all times relevant hereto, defendant City of Pittsburgh was acting by and through its duly authorized agents, employees and/or assigns, who were then and there acting within the course and scope of their employment and under the color of state law.
- 9. At all times relevant hereto, the defendant City of Pittsburgh had a custom, policy, or practice, of failing to adequately train, discipline, supervise, and/or regulate

police officers employed by it who engaged in secondary employment with private employers while attired in City of Pittsburgh police uniforms, utilizing City of Pittsburgh Police Department issued equipment, and otherwise exercising the authority vested in them by the public as officers of the law for the benefit of their private employers in the performance of their private duties and employment.

- 10. At all times relevant hereto, the defendant City of Pittsburgh was aware that City of Pittsburgh Police officers attired in their City of Pittsburgh uniforms, using City of Pittsburgh issued equipment, exhibiting their City of Pittsburgh badge of authority, and otherwise exercising their public authority incident to their private employment, had carried out false arrests, used excessive force and/or filed false, malicious criminal charges against citizens.
- 11. Despite such knowledge, defendant City of Pittsburgh has with deliberate indifference failed to take adequate precautions to protect citizens from the abusive practices of its police officers engaged in secondary employment, including the failure to adequate train, discipline, supervise, and/or monitor such employment.
- 12. Defendant Mark Eggleton is an adult individual residing in the City Pittsburgh, who at all times relevant hereto, in the performance of his duties on behalf of the defendant Original Hot Dog Shops Inc., was acting under color of state law, attired in his City of Pittsburgh issued police uniform, utilizing City of Pittsburgh issued equipment, and displaying his City of Pittsburgh police badge of authority.
- 13. Defendant Brian Roberts is an adult individual residing in the City of Pittsburgh, who at all times relevant hereto, in the performance of his duties on behalf of the defendant Original Hot Dog Shops Inc., was acting under color of state law, attired in

his City of Pittsburgh issued police uniform, utilizing City of Pittsburgh issued equipment, and displaying his City of Pittsburgh police badge of authority. This defendant is sued based upon his failure to intervene to stop defendant Eggleton's unconstitutional conduct as herein described, even though he was aware of such conduct, and had the opportunity to intervene and stop it.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:

- 14. On August 29, 2004 in the early morning hours, Deven W. Werling, was in the "Original Hot Dog Shop" located in the Oakland section of the City of Pittsburgh, sitting at a table with friends eating food he had purchased at the "Original Hot Dog Shop" (hereinafter the "Original").
- 15. As he sat eating his food, Mr. Werling observed a uniformed security guard outside of the "Original" apparently breaking up a fight between two individuals, during which the security guard sprayed pepper spray.
- 16. Although sprayed outside, the pepper spray wafted into the "Original" affecting Mr. Werling and his friends causing them to gag, choke and their eyes to burn. Mr. Werling reacted by rubbing his eyes commenting "why did these jackasses have to spray so much pepper spray".
- 17. Although not stated to him, Mr. Werling's comments were overheard by defendant Eggleton, the security guard who sprayed the pepper spray. Enraged, Eggleton came up behind Mr. Werling, and screamed "what did you say, you got to leave."
- 18. Mr. Werling asked Eggleton why he had to leave the "Original", explaining that he was eating food purchased at the "Original". At that point, Eggleton without provocation swiped Werling's food off the table, throwing it onto the floor. He then

grabbed Werling and pushed him up against a glass window jamming his baton against Mr. Werling's throat choking him to the point where Werling nearly lost consciousness. Werling was then flung across the room. Mr. Werling's was hit in the mid-section and thrown into a large glass cooler where he fell to the ground.

- 19. After this violent unprovoked attack, Mr. Werling, assisted by one of his friends, left the "Original" and walked up Forbes Avenue towards the Primanti Brothers Sandwich Shop, nearly a block away from the "Original" when he noticed two officers charging down the sidewalk coming towards him. At that point Mr. Werling stopped to call 911 for help and to report what happened.
- 20. When Eggleton caught up to Mr. Werling he told him that "nobody is going to screw up my 22 years of service". He then grabbed Werling, confiscated his phone, and violently threw him up against a building and hand-cuffed him.
- 21. Werling was arrested on false charges of resisting arrest, defiant trespass, and disorderly conduct.
- 22. Mr. Werling was subsequently transported to the Allegheny County Jail where he remained incarcerated for approximately 15 hours.
- 23. Subsequent to the events of August 29, 2004, Mr. Werling called the City of Pittsburgh Bureau of Police to complain about Eggleton's conduct. He spoke to an individual who identified herself as Eggleton's supervisor. The supervisor subsequently informed Eggleton of Werling's complaint.
- 24. After Eggleton was informed of Werling's complaint, Eggleton added additional false charges against Werling of obstruction of justice, and aggravated assault. In addition, he falsely claimed that Werling had injured him.

- 25. On the 13th day of April, 2005, Plaintiff was found not guilty of all criminal charges that remained at the time of trial, including aggravated assault, defiant trespass and disorderly conduct. The charges of resisting arrest and obstruction of justice filed by Eggleton were previously dismissed by the District Magistrate at the preliminary hearing.
- 26. As a result of the defendants' conduct as hereinbefore described, plaintiff has suffered severe emotional distress, embarrassment, humiliation and damage to his reputation.
- 27. As a direct result of defendants' conduct as hereinbefore described, plaintiff has suffered physical injuries, including injuries to his neck, back and head.
- 28. As a direct result of defendants' conduct as hereinbefore described, plaintiff's rights under the first, fourth and fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution were violated. The violation of these rights made actionable against the defendants named herein pursuant to the Civil Rights Act of 1871, as amended, 42 U.S.C. §1983. In regard to such claims, plaintiff's right to be free from retaliation on account of protected speech was violated, as were his rights to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures and the use of excessive and unreasonable force, and to be free from false and malicious prosecution.
- 29. As a direct result of defendants' conduct, plaintiff was subject to a commonlaw false arrest, assault, battery, and malicious prosecution.
- 30. As a direct result of defendants' conduct, plaintiff has incurred medical expenses for the treatment of physical and emotional injuries, and also has incurred legal expenses for the defense of the false criminal charges filed against him by defendant Eggleton.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff requests judgment in his favor in a sum in excess of \$50,000.00, including compensatory and punitive damages, such latter damages sought against the individually named defendants, and the Original Hot Dog Shops Inc. Plaintiff also seeks the recovery of costs and attorney's fees, and any and all other relief that this court deems just and appropriate under the circumstances.

Respectfully submitted,

Timothy P. O'Brien, Esquire

PA I. D. #22104

1705 Allegheny Building

429 Forbes Avenue

Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Jere Krakoff, Esquire PA I.D. 13701 1705 Allegheny Building 429 Forbes Avenue Pittsburgh, PA 15219 (412) 232-0276

Attorneys for plaintiff

CONTINUATION SHEET FOR DEFENDANTS:

THE CITY OF PITTSBURGH, ORIGINAL HOT DOG SHOPS INC., Trading and Doing Business as THE ORIGINAL HOT DOG SHOP, And BRIAN ROBERTS